Remarks

Response to Restriction Requirement

1. In the Office Action mailed February 9, 2006, the claims were divided into two groups, Group I, claims 1, 2, and 4-11, drawn to a method of using a glycosaminoglycan degrading enzyme; and Group II, claims 12, 13, and 15-18, drawn to a formulation containing the enzyme.

In response, applicants elect Group I, claims 1, 2, and 4-11, with traverse.

Applicants traverse the restriction requirement regarding groups I and II as currently set forth for the following reasons. To be valid, a restriction requirement must establish both that (1) the "inventions" are either independent or distinct, **and** (2) that examination of more than one of the "inventions" would constitute a burden to the Examiner. The term "independent" (i.e., not dependent) means that there is no disclosed relationship between the two or more subjects disclosed, that is, they are unconnected in design, operation, or effect. MPEP § 806.04.

The present application is based on the discovery that the glycosaminoglycan chondroitin sulfates play a vital role in cell proliferation, and therefore their removal by treatment with a glycocosamoniglycan-degrading enzyme would inhibit cell proliferation, making them useful in treating a cell proliferation disorders. Claims 1, 2, and 4-11 are drawn to a method of using a glycosaminoglycan-degrading enzyme to treat, remove and degrade glycosaminoglycans from proteoglycans by administering an effective amount of a glycosaminoglycan-degrading enzyme to treat a cell proliferation disorder. Claims 12, 13, and 15-18 are drawn to a formulation for administration to an individual, the formulation comprising an effective amount of a glycosaminoglycan degrading enzyme to inhibit endothelial cell proliferation. Groups I and II

are related as product and process of use. Applicants contend that it would not constitute a burden on the Examiner to examine Groups I and II together.

2. The Office Action also required election of a species from among enzymes, disorders and modes of administration. In response, Applicants elect for examination chondroitinase as the species from among enzymes. Claims 1, 2, and 4-11 read on chondroitinase. Applicants elect local administration as the species from among modes of administration. Claims 1 and 10 read on local administration. Applicants elect hypertrophic scars as the species from among disorders. Claims 1 and 8 read on hypertrophic scars.

Amendments to the claims

Claim 1 has been amended to define a method of using a glycosaminoglycan-degrading enzyme to treat a cell proliferation disorder. Support for the amendment can be found at least at page 10, line 6 until page 11, line 4. Claims 2 and 5 have been amended to correct typographical errors. Claim 8 has been amended to limit the disorder to hypertrophic scars.

Examination of claims 1, 2, 4-13 and 15-18, as amended, is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Rivka D. Monheit

Rivka D. Monheit
Reg. No. 48,731

Date: March 9, 2006

PABST PATENT GROUP LLP
400 Colony Square, Suite 1200
1201 Peachtree Street